REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 9-14. Claims 1-8 have been canceled in favor of new claims 9-14. Support for the claims may be found, inter alia, in the original claims. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and failing to conform with U.S. practice. In response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-8 in favor of new claims 9-14 which, it is respectfully submitted, improve the form of the claims and obviate the rejection.

Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gause et al. U.S. Patent No. 3,750,479* in view of *Brown U.S. Patent No. 6,551,219*. Claims 4-6 were rejected over *Gause et al.* and *Brown* in view of either *Andrus et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,000,172* (claims 4 and 6) or *Henry et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,910,070* (claim 5). Claims 7 and 8 were not rejected on the basis of the prior art.

Essentially, the Examiner's position was (1) that *Gause et al.* discloses the raisable platform recited in the claims except for wheels housed beneath the frame for transporting the device, (2) that *Brown* teaches the use of wheels on a bike support frame, and (3) that it would have been obvious to provide the *Gause et al.* frame with wheels housed beneath the frame. *Andrus et al.* was cited with respect to claims 4 and 6 as teaching a remotely controlled computer accessed via cables for a physical type environment of use. *Henry et al.* was cited with respect to claim 5 as teaching an exercise system having a remote control which is hand held.

In response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-8 in favor of new claims 9-14 and respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection for the following reasons.

As set forth in new claim 9, Applicant's invention provides a raisable platform for a stationary bicycle including raisable means comprising pincers in oblique layout with opposing mouths and with lips that mutually self-embed in pairs, activated by an axle; an electric motor connected to the axle which is extended and extendable by screwing of the motor; a rounded tubular housing placed in a hinge of one of the pincers where is screwed

the screwing determining the opening of the opposite mouths of both pincers; a support bridge which has a core in "U" shape where the lips of the pincers are joined to; an inclined metal strip fixed at an edge of a base plate; metal sections fixed to a transverse section also joined to a "U" shaped plate that holds the lips; and an axle on which wheels are fixed with respect to the general mounting. In this way, a raisable platform is provided which is adaptable for any type of bike for the practice of stationary sports.

None of the patents cited by the Examiner have the structure set forth in Applicant's claim 9 or teach the benefits which result from that structure. The primary reference to *Gause* discloses a restraint system for securing a person to an ergometer while exercising under zero gravity conditions or while operating the ergometer. There is no disclosure or suggestion of any raisable means for raising a platform on which it is possible to fix articles for the practice of stationary sports.

The defects and deficiencies of the primary reference to *Gause* are nowhere remedied by any of the secondary references to *Brown*, *Andrus et al.* or *Henry et al.*. *Brown* discloses an exercise or physical therapy apparatus which provide both tonic and phasic

exercise. In this apparatus, there is a raisable platform but neither the means used for raising the platform nor the apparatus itself are similar to that recited in Applicant's claim 9, as amended, in which the raising means are oriented to allow the platform to be raised by means of an electric motor at one of its ends. The raising means disclosed in *Brown* do not have any pincers actuated by a motor which modifies the position of the mouths of the pincers by screwing of the ends of a screwed axle screwing in a rounded tubular housing positioned firmly in the hinge of the opposite pincer. Thus, even if *Brown* were to be combined with *Gause et al.*, one would still not achieve the structure set forth in Applicant's claim 9.

Andrus et al. discloses a physical exercise video system which includes a physical exercise machine, a video system and an interface module, where the video system has a computer. *Henry et al.* discloses a weighted hand-controller for remote control of an exercise apparatus. Although *Andrus et al.* shows the feature of using a remote control and *Henry et al.* shows the feature of using a remote control incorporated into its handlebars, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the structure of Applicant's raisable platform as set forth in claim 9.

In summary, claims 1-8 have been canceled and new claims 9-14 have been added. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
MANUEL QUIROS GRANADOS - 1

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802
FJD:jc

Allison C. Collard, Reg.No.22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298
Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Fax No. 703-872-9302

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile-transmission to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 6, 2004.

Frederick J. Dorchak